

III. REMARKS

1. The Examiner is thanked for numerous telephone conferences. During those telephone conferences it was agreed that by adding "using the computer system for" before the various steps, the claims would recite statutory subject matter. This has been done.

Hence, the rejection of claims 20-23 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

In the present invention there are different kinds of receiver agents (p. 10, ll. 19 and 20), one is an ordinary agent which is expressly addressed by the sender agent. The other is a monitor agent which receives a message from a sender agent without being addressed by the sender agent.

In Tada the monitor 102 (or broker) agent transmits a message to a collection of agents which are registered with the broker. Thus, there is only one kind of receiving agent. Note that Col. 2, ll. 20-25, disclose two possibilities.

First, if agent 101 has knowledge of agent 103, it directly communicates with agent 103. There is no disclosure of cooperation promotor (manager agent) 102 receiving any message from agent 101 or of any associated message transmitted by agent 102 to agents 101 or 103, all as required by claims 20 and 28.

Second, if agent 101 does not know of agent 103, it communicates with promotor 102. In turn, promotor 102 communicates with (by addressing) agent 103 and agent 103 performs the requested task and returns the results to promotor 102. Then the results are returned to agent 101. Note that "advertise" 110 is not an associated message as recited in the claims, but agent 103

initially informing promotor 102 of the functions it can provide (Col. 2, ll. 15-17).

Claims 20 and 28 have been amended to recite "without said other agent addressing said manager agent." Since this is not disclosed in Tada for the second possibility, and since the claims do not read on the first possibility, the rejection of claims 20 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102 on Tada should be withdrawn.

Further, since these features are not suggested by Tada, these claims are unobvious over it.

Weber also fails to disclose these features. Thus, the rejection of claims 21 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103 on Tada in view of Weber should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Jan. 27, 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 119
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to (703) 872-9306 on the date indicated below.

Date: 1/27/05

Signature: Doris W. Pease